British Nationalist
FOR RACE AND NATION
SEPTEMBER 1987
12p
BNP

CARNIVAL OF MAYHEM

Time to ban Notting Hill crime and riot orgy

QUITE PREDICTABLY, this year's Notting Hill Carnival, held over the August Bank Holiday, degenerated into mayhem.

Crime rocketed by 100 per-cent over last year, and this included one killing. On the first day of the carnival a soft drink seller was stabbed to death by a black youth in an argument over the price of a bottle of coca cola. Gangs of up to 50 youths went on mugging raids, charging through the streets and robbing bystanders. Many victims were blinded with ammonia before being robbed, with some lone members of the public being picked upon by as many as 30 muggers at a time.

245 crimes were reported on Sunday, August 30th alone, including 150 robberies and 30 assaults. According to Mr. Paul Condon, Deputy Assistant Commissioner at Scotland Yard, the use of knives was greater that in previous years. Apart from the stabbing to death of the soft drink salesman, a young woman constable, Donna Kingsley, was also stabbed — though fortunately she later recovered.

As a rule, no doubt on political directives, a policy of 'softly-softly' policing is followed in handling this mainly West Indian event. This year, despite the mobilisation of 7,000 police, only just over 70 arrests were made. This was in spite of the fact that the carnival ended in a riot.

The riot broke out when police eventually intervened in force in efforts to put a stop to the further terrorising of people in the area. Reports described riot police, wearing steel helmets and carrying shields, as having to be drafted in from many districts outside the area. According to one report in *The Star*, the police ''faced a barrage of missiles as they formed battle lines under the Westway flyover. Then they charged the hundreds of black youths.''

PLEA TO DISPERSE

Eventually, a senior police officer appealed to the crowd to disperse, saying with a megaphone: ''Please go home; it is not safe here for any of us.'' The views of ordinary officers present at the event about being required to plead with rioters in this way were not recorded.

Nevertheless, the violence and mayhem of this 'carnival' — supposedly dedicated to promoting Afro-Caribbean 'rock music' but also featuring left-wing 'black power' agitprop, this year including the African terrorist ANC — were highlighted by Mr. Condon after the event. The Deputy Assistant Commissioner remarked: ''I think that society as a whole must decide whether the criminal side of the carnival is too high a price to pay for the fun side.''

Describing the character of the event as he saw it, he said: ''The paradox is that the atmosphere can be super, friendly and marvellous, but within a

Contd. at foot of page 2

WEEKEND OF VIOLENCE

THE START: ALL FUN AND JOLLITY
The police, as pictured here, carried out the order from their superiors to be as friendly as possible towards the revellers

HOW IT ENDED UP
Police riot squad move in to make arrest

STABBING VICTIM
WPC Donna Kingsley (pictured here) received a knife in the back from a black thug. Fortunately, she recovered



ONE OF MANY
Yet another trouble-maker gets taken in by police. Carnival crime increased 100 per-cent over last year

THE DEAD AND THE BEREAVED

Michael Galvin (left) with little daughter Valerie. He was stabbed to death by a West Indian

The victim's wife Patricia and his brother Peter (right) at a press conference following the murder

British
Nationalist

No. 71 SEPTEMBER 1987

Editor: John Morse

MORE 'ONE WORLD' POISON

THE UNITED NATIONS took the lead last month in a publicity splurge about the population of the globe passing the five-billion mark. This event was trumpeted as "a landmark for the human race."

The UN, it should never be forgotten, is the embryo form of what is intended, by the internationalist powers behind the scenes, to become a world government, in which it is projected that independent nations will ultimately be merged and abolished and global power concentrated in the hands of a self-chosen few. No wonder that the occasion was seized upon by the UN's bigwigs as one for yet more propaganda designed to focus attention on the so-called 'sufferings' of the world's poor.

The message being pushed at our own people, and their fellow Whites in other countries, was clearly the falsehood that 'all mankind' is a single unit, undifferentiated by any distinctions of race but only by distinctions of wealth. The implication intended was that the better off nations had some kind of 'moral duty' to shoulder the burden of providing for the world's poor. Naturally, the better off meant, in practice, just the white nations.

In this propaganda it is never admitted that, to the extent that the white nations are better off, this may be because their peoples have done more to EARN the wealth that they possess, having shown greater qualities of inventiveness, skill, industry and thrift than the others. Instead, Whites are supposed to swallow the idea that such wealth as they possess has come to them purely by chance, as it were by the toss of a coin — or because they have in the past 'exploited' the less well off races.

Those who push such poisonous lies do so only in order to induce the white nations to surrender their right to the fruits of their own labours and ability and eventually their whole existence as independent nations — in favour of a one-world authority which, so it is assumed, will then dispense the world's wealth 'equally' between all the nations and races, quite regardless of whether these nations and races have made equal contributions to the creation of that wealth.

This is the high road to the slavery of the one-world order that is planned by the international bankers and power monopolists and their stooges (our own politicians, whom they have mainly bought).

This 'one-world' guff has certainly taken hold of at least one section of the world's white population. It is the typical snivelling cant of the bleeding-heart 'liberal' who, in any racial contest, makes it a matter of principle to take sides with every race except his own. It is of course only among Whites that this diseased, not to say suicidal, mentality of liberalism is to be found.

Other races in the world — and especially races such as the Japanese — seek their own expansion and advancement, if necessary (indeed preferably) at the expense of the Whites, who are regarded by most other races as the world's suckers.

We Whites have only ourselves to blame if this has happened — we should not blame the coloured races for doing what nature demands and

Contd. on back page

IF HESS HAD SUCCEEDED...

OXFORD Professor of Modern History Norman Stone, writing in the Daily Mail the day after the death of Rudolf Hess, conjured up an imaginative vision of the world as it might have been had Hess's self-imposed mission, aimed at making peace between Britain and Germany in May 1941, succeeded in its objective. In Professor Stone's words:-

> "Imagine a map of the world in which the British Empire still exists, coloured in red. It contains another empire, coloured in black: the Greater German Reich, stretching not just to Western Poland but towards the Urals and the Caucusus; Siberia is a gigantic German satellite.
>
> "The two powers are in alliance — the one with a large navy, the other with a huge army. Together they dominate Africa and defy the United States. There will have been no communist domination of Eastern Europe, no Americanisation of Western Europe, no dissolution of the British Empire, no independence for India. The Teutonic and Anglo-Saxon races will rule the world."

Would this have really been such an undesirable prospect? Is the alternative — the world that has emerged from Britain's refusal to do a deal with Hess in 1941 — a preferable one? As things turned out, what we have seen has been the collapse of Britain as a world power and domination of Britain and Western Europe by the United States, which, in collaboration with the Soviet Union, has stripped us of our empire. Our economy has been in a permanent state of ill health ever since the war and our home territory has been thrown open to the millions of Africa and Asia.

WAS HE NOT RIGHT?

Such are the fruits that Britain has reaped from her decision to go on prosecuting the war against Hitler's Germany, against all the pleadings of Rudolf Hess that she should not. So was Hess not right after all? Were those in this country who urged that we should listen to him and come to an accomodation with National Socialism after all wrong?

Britain's rulers in 1939 led her into a war from which she never stood to gain anything, whatever the outcome. When they had a chance, as in 1940, to make an honourable withdrawal from that war with all British territory intact, they refused to do so. When in 1941 the German Deputy Fuhrer, risking his life to fly to our shores, offered the same chance again, once more our rulers refused. But in fact the war they were determined to carry on was one in which we stood, not only to gain nothing, but to lose everything. Now, 42 years after the end of that war, we can see that national ruin is the only visible result.

Professor Stone remarks further in his *Mail* article:-

> "Every time Germany and Great Britain clashed — in the 1880s, in the First World War, in the 1930s and even in the Second World War, there was no lack of people to complain that the quarrelling was madness, suicide.
>
> "One such character was Hitler's Deputy Rudolf Hess."

Significantly, the same edition of the *Daily Mail*, in its editorial and other comment on Hess's death, attempted to justify Britain's participation in World War II — but without the least effort to demonstrate that any specific British national interest was being threatened by Germany before the outbreak of hostilities in 1939.

IN BRITAIN'S INTEREST

And nowhere else in press and other media editorial comment, whether in the *Mail* or elsewhere, was the smallest recognition given to Rudolf Hess as one of the champions of a policy, having many supporters in this country as well as in Germany, which, had it been applied, would have brought immense benefits to **Britain**. Instead, Hess was denounced on the nonsensical grounds that his political beliefs were in some way 'evil' — as if that had any relevance to the question of British interests involved in the war!

For were not the political beliefs of the Soviet leaders in 1941-45 also evil? But that did not prevent us fighting with them side-by-side and helping them to spread their monstrous empire halfway across Europe!

For Britain to have embraced an alliance with Germany in 1940 or 1941 it did not require that we adopted the German political system. The policy of Hitler, supported by his faithful lieutenant Hess, was that what Britain did in her own island and her own empire was her own business; it was only required that Britain leave Germany to look after **her** business. None of the things that many people disliked about the Nazi method of government need have been introduced here if we did not want them.

It is our own belief that Britain, in order to compete in the modern world and preserve and organise her empire, would have needed to make big political changes in her own system of government, in her economy and in her society. However, such changes would have been her own choice — to adopt or reject as she preferred. She certainly was under no obligation to copy the German system merely on account of recognising that, in the international field, she and Germany had common interests and had nothing whatever to gain by going to war with each other.

The kind of hideous world we live in today is largely the product of that fateful decision that we took in 1941 not to heed Rudolf Hess or his chief at home in Germany but to carry on the war for Germany's — and our own — destruction.

That is why we believe that Britain's role in the subsequent treatment of Hess — his inhuman imprisonment for 46 years — was especially shameful. For history will vindicate Hess and show that he was a true friend of this country — indeed a much greater friend than the power-hungry politicians who presided over British affairs in World War II and led us to disaster and catastrophe.

THE DEPUTY FUHRER
Picture of Hess in the 1930s

THE PRISONER
Hess shortly before his death

One other couragous journalist, John Junor of the *Sunday Express*, put it succintly. "The only person to emerge with dignity from the Hess affair," he stated, "has been Hess himself."

Perhaps even Mr. Junor did not realise, when he wrote those words, how fully right he was.

DEGRADING BEHAVIOUR

Labour exhibitionists go crawling for 'ethnic' votes

WHILST multi-racialist exhibitionism is now the order of the day amongst Tory, Liberal and Social Democrat politicians alike — all regarding the ethnic minority bloc votes as the key to grabbing and holding onto political office — the Labour Party seems to degenerated one step further than its rivals in its ethnic grovelling. By such means, Labour plainly intends to keep a step ahead of the other party gangs in this degrading contest.

Pictured on the left here are the Lord Mayor and Lady Mayoress of Bradford. The population of this city is now said to be about one third Asian. The Tories and the Labour Party have been vying for the immigrant vote for some years, but it is Labour, currently in control of the city, which clearly is in the lead.

DRESSED IN INDIAN GEAR

The Mayor, Councillor Coughlin, and his wife, resplendent in Asian garb, give some clue as to how this is being done. They saw fit to don their Indian costumes as part of the city's new 'Asia Day' celebrations. This ethnic minority cultural festival is described in the press as "the brainchild of two local schoolboys, Muzzafer Hussain and his brother Parvez Iqbal." The Mayor and Mayoress seem to have considered it expedient to patronise the event.

IMMIGRANTS COME FIRST

That they deliberately chose to do so by making a public exhibition of themselves is perhaps a pointer to what might be expected by any ordinary British voter still tempted to regard Labour as the supposed party of Britain's 'working class'. In multi-racial Britain, the Labour Party, just as much as the Tories, has set itself a new scale of priorities in which the British worker has been placed very low down.

As the likes of Mr. and Mrs. Coughlin expose their own race and nation to contempt by their ludicrous antics and posturings, the ethnic minorities themselves (and Asians in particular) will know what conclusions to draw.

In the meantime we may ask: **where — other than in the British National Party — can there be found politial leaders who are still proud of being British and white?**

GROVELLERS
The Lord Mayor of Bradford and his wife dress up in Indian costume to court favour with local Asians

CARNIVAL OF MAYHEM

(Contd. from prev. page)

few minutes totally hostile in the same location. The catalyst is always criminal action, with police trying to intervene, and that is when the mood turns nasty."

POLICE MAY NOT ACT

What the Deputy Assistant Commissioner is really saying here is that the Blacks at the carnival are perfectly good humoured as long as none of their number is arrested for any of the crimes that frequently occur; the moment, however, that police attempt to do their job properly and prevent such crimes, the mood immediately changes into one of hostility and hatred!

The attitude of ordinary Britons resident in the area was spoken for by Mr. Richard Miller, the next-door neighbour of the murdered soft drinks seller, Mr. Michael Galvin: "The event should have been cancelled. It is a disgrace that it is allowed to go on. The carnival is getting out of hand."

But, speaking of the murder, Mr. Condon remarked: "I don't think that incident, however tragic it was, will put the carnival in jeopardy."

COURTING 'ETHNIC' VOTE

Mr. Condon is almost certainly correct. Britain's politicians, in order to pander to the 'ethnic minority' vote, have always been falling over themselves to drool over this annual event, despite the endless trouble that has arisen from it. Mrs. Thatcher has called it "Europe's *mardi gras*," while Neil Kinnock has at least on one occasion deliberately made himself conspicuous at the carnival in the presence of West Indians.

Indeed, no MP of whom we are aware, apart from Terry Dicks, the Tory member for Hillingdon and one of the very few honest and courageous people in the House of Commons, has suggested that the carnival henceforth be cancelled in the interests of law and order.

There is not the slightest doubt that were the occasion a festival of British nationalism and patriotism, there would be loud screams throughout parliament and in the media for it to be banned — if the result was one tenth as bad as we have seen at the Notting Hill Carnival this year.

Our position on this matter is unequivocal: the carnival must in future be banned. Ultimately, however, the proper solution to the crime and violence rampant in Britain's 'multi-racial' society is for the ethnic minority population to be removed from Britain by means of resettlement overseas, preferably in their countries of origin. This is vital in the interests both of the British people and the law-abiding members of the ethnic minorities alike, for the latter will surely suffer in the explosion that is bound to come if the disastrous multi-racial experiment is not ended and Britain returned to the native British people to whom it belongs.

So again we say to the politicians: **Act Now! Stop immigration — start repatriation! Terminate multi-racialism before it all ends in catastrophe!**

More naval cuts

TORIES ABANDON DEFENCE PROMISES MADE AT GENERAL ELECTION

ONE OF the most repulsive confidence tricks by which the Tories repeatedly get themselves re-elected to office is their cynical pretence that they intend to promote national defence. But behind the spouting of patriotic-sounding words at election time Tory defence policy indeed shows a lamentable record in the way of providing Britain with real national security.

After repeatedly promising that, in the words of their 1979 election manifesto, they would "not hesitate to spend what is necessary on our armed forces," the Tories are now engaging in savage financial cut-backs on defence. Defence Secretary George Younger has chosen the Navy to take the brunt of the cuts. These cuts, scheduled for the Autumn, have been described in the press as another "morale-sapping blow" — just at the moment when Mrs. Thatcher is hastening to put Britain's scarce resources of warships and fighting men at the disposal of the Americans in the Persian Gulf.

This is a re-run of the Tories' 1981 defence betrayal. At that time Mrs. Thatcher and her then Defence Secretary John Nott tried to push through massive reductions in naval expenditure that would have led to the Royal Navy being run down to little more than a coastal defence force, scarcely capable of meeting any commitment beyond home waters. What was proposed would have left Britain without any aircraft carriers and other essential classes of warships, and would have meant the disbanding of the Royal Marines.

SHOWED LOSS OF WILL

The only thing that prevented these cuts being implemented at the time was the Argentine invasion of the Falkland Islands. It may, however, have been public knowledge of the intended cuts that convinced the Argentines that Britain had lost the will to defend her own interests and would not go to protect the Falklands in the event of an invasion.

At any rate, in the aftermath of the Falklands War it was widely assumed that the intended cuts had been cancelled. But now it turns out that this is not so. The 'three-per-year' programme of new vessels needed to keep the fleet at a level of 50 ships available to fight at any time — the very minimum regarded as sufficient to give any security at all to British interests in home waters and further afield — is to go by the board. Treasury 'cash limits' are once again being given priority over national defence. Thus the existing naval construction programme is to be 'stretched out', whilst no new frigates have been ordered this year.

In addition, plans to modernise the assault ships INTREPID and FEARLESS, of Falklands fame, may be scrapped. This could mean the beginning of the end for the Marines. At the end of this process Britain could be left so enfeebled that she could no longer respond to anything comparable to the invasion of the Falklands. The Defence Department is now said to be "living from day to day" because of the financial problems that the government's policies have caused.

This, however, is by no means all of the story. Mr. Younger refuses even to review Britain's defence commitments so as to reallocate the resources made available to him by the Treasury in favour of the Navy. Such a review might lead to cuts in British forces in West Germany. This, it is being said, might be "taken by other European NATO allies as a signal for them to cut back at a time when the super power moves towards nuclear disarmament are making conventional defences more crucial."

All this is nonsense. The fact is that the much vaunted 'threat' of a Soviet invasion of Western Europe — always the justification for British forces being tied down in West Germany — is a non-starter. Both Soviet and American forces are stationed in the two powers' respective zones of Germany mainly for the purpose of maintaining a permanent occupation of that country, but also for the purpose of occupying Europe as a whole. No other reason either for Soviet Bloc or NATO forces exists.

Britain could acquire all the land and air forces that she needs for the defence of her vital interests at home and around the world merely by withdrawing her army and RAF units from Germany. At the same time, the vast financial saving that this policy would make possible would release much needed monies for the maintenance of her forces at sea, including the replacement of obsolete ships and the modernisation, where necessary, of existing ones.

NEED TO QUIT N.A.T.O.

Britain's vital defence needs require that we opt out of such internationalist groupings as NATO and redeploy British forces solely under British command in those areas at home and overseas where specific national interests demand. This, among other things, would enable us always to ensure that the Falkland Islands are adequately defended against any attempted repeat of an invasion by Argentina.

Also, if the Tories were to be true to their assertion, made in 1979, that the needs of defence must be paid for up to the limit necessary they would make the cuts required by the Treasury in other, much less essential, fields. One of these would be overseas aid, where currently £1,300 million a year is being lavished on mostly ungrateful and unfriendly countries of the 'Third World'. Another is the highly expensive apparatus of 'race relations' focussing attention on the dangerous disarmament policies of their Labour opponents and posing once again as the party which stood for a Britain strongly defended. Again, as the facts show, this posture was a sham. Britain is little safer from foreign attack under Mrs. Thatcher than under Mr. Kinnock. The difference between the policies of these two major parties is only that,



IN DANGER OF SCRAPPING
Intrepid: carrier of Royal Marines

maintained at home in Britain for the purpose of shoring up the disastrous experiment of multi-racialism that has been foisted on the British people.

These are just two areas in which the Government could — but does not — make savings in order to find the money to ensure that British forces are kept up to a level compatible with Britain's vital needs.

At the last election, just as in 1979, the Tories garnered many votes by



IN DANGER OF SCRAPPING
Fearless: won fame in Falklands War

under the Tories, a foreign conquest of Britain might take two or three weeks longer!

We nationalists believe in DOING what the Tories always say they will do but never honour in practice: give national defence absolute top priority over all public spending and bring our defences up to the level necessary to safeguard all British interests at home and around the world. This is the first duty of any British government.

THATCHER ENSLAVES BRITAIN TO REAGAN'S MIDDLE EAST POLICY

THE UNITED STATES is increasingly entangling itself in a totally unnecessary confrontation with Iran in the Persian Gulf whilst Mrs. Thatcher slavishly hastens to drag Britain into the conflict as President Reagan's ever more faithful poodle. This is becoming increasingly obvious as the US embroils itself with Iran in the Iran-Iraq war and our Prime Minister once again unconditionally puts Britain's resources at the disposal of US foreign policy.

To begin with, President Reagan has been allowing foreign tanker operators, especially the Kuwaitis, who run a tanker fleet largely crewed by Filipino seamen, to register their ships under the US flag. They are then allowed to claim the protection of the US Navy, which has so far lost one warship (the *USS Stark*) to an attack, not by an Iranian plane but by an Iraqi one. Since it was Iraq that started the present Gulf War, Iraq that began the policy of attacking foreign tankers and Iraq which committed the flagrant act of war against the United States, the true rationale for American involvement effectively on the side of Iraq in this utterly alien quarrel remains a mystery which has yet to be explained to us.

Despite this, Kuwaiti tankers are now being given the green light by the British government to register their vessels under our own 'red duster'. Incredibly, Mrs. Thatcher has said that if the Kuwaitis, or any other foreign ship-owners, wish to do this Britain will regard it as purely a "commercial decision."

TAKING ON BURDEN

This is in spite of the fact that Britain will thereby be burdened with an obligation to defend these foreign ships. This in turn will render us liable to become embroiled ourselves in the clash between Iran and Iraq in which we have not the slightest interest at stake.

Currently, a number of Royal Navy minesweepers are being dispatched to the region. The risk to the lives of British naval personnel from this operation is openly admitted.

Whilst it is obvious that Britain should never hold back from committing her fighting men unstintingly to any operation in which there is a clear national interest — as in the Falklands, for example — it is nothing less than criminal for the blood of the nation's manhood to be risked in causes which have nothing whatever to do with Britain. In the present case British forces are being used to support a policy of the US government which in fact many Americans themselves regard as contrary to their own country's real interests, as well as those of the western nations as a whole.

Ponderable quote

"US (presidential) candidates need to secure the financial backing of those vested ethnic, economic and religious pressure groups whose support may be indispensable. Mr. Reagan's big success, especially in 1984, was his capture of so much of the traditionally Democratic Jewish vote. IT WILL BE AXIOMATIC FOR ALL CANDIDATES TO SWEAR ALLEGIANCE TO ISRAEL." (Our Editor's emphasis).

Report in THE FINANCIAL TIMES (25th August 1987).

THE ISRAELI INTEREST

Although some mystery surrounds the exact motives of the US government in the present Gulf crisis, there is no mystery at all about who generally draws the overall benefit from American actions in the Middle East. By and large, American policy is conducted in such a way as to benefit **Israel** rather than the United States.

The enormous power of the Zionist lobby in Washington has served to guarantee that the US will always give priority to Israel above everything in its conduct of Middle Eastern affairs. It is in this way that the interests of the 3 million or so Jewish settlers in Israel have consistently figured in US calculations above those of the 100 million Arabs.

Israel is a tiny bankrupt state which has little of value that America or other western nations would want, but which milks the United States of billions of dollars in foreign aid each year. In return, all that America gets is the souring of her relations with the Arabs, who control the bulk of her oil supplies. To the extent that Britain and other western nations fall in with US policy, they have suffered the same consequences — for no good reason whatsoever from their own point of view.

ALWAYS FOLLOWING U.S.

Mrs. Thatcher has spent her years in office fanatically binding Britain hand and foot to every aspect of Reagan's foreign policy. Nowhere has this been more evident than in the Middle East. She allowed US bomber planes to use Britain as a base for their attack on Israel's enemy, Libya, in 1986, thereby needlessly embroiling this country in a clash with another Arab state where it had no vital concerns of its own to defend at all.

It is worth noting that in the current Gulf War the Israelis have been peddling arms to Iran for many years. It is being said in the United States that it was Israel that persuaded Reagan to sell weapons to Iran at the very moment he was telling the world that the US would never do business with countries that supported terrorism! Many of these weapons may shortly be used to kill British servicemen.

It is significant that the nationalist-minded Japanese, dependent on Gulf oil to a far greater degree than Britain, have determinedly refused to get involved in the region in the same way.

It is high time Britain stopped being an international fall guy. It is time to put an end to the criminal and treasonable policy of allowing our resources of men and material to be exploited and squandered in alien wars — for real aims of which we are allowed to know nothing but can only, on past showing, suspect the worst.

LET'S HOPE HE COMES BACK
British seaman gets goodbye kiss from his fiance as he sails for the gulf, a pawn in an alien war

YOUR LETTERS

Sir, — I would be grateful if you would put a 'Thank-you' message into *British Nationalist* for the anonymous person from Leeds who sent a £10 postal order to Ipswich BNP.

Enclosed is a newspaper cutting regarding a Bedfordshire parish where some of the parishioners are strongly opposed to having an Asian vicar imposed upon them. This story has received a great deal of coverage on East Anglian television. This is good, because although the parishioners (as with the Harwich opponents of the Tamil prison ship) deny any 'racist' motivation it shows that ordinary people who are normally apolitical are beginning to turn against the multi-racial system. The fact that in both cases they are prepared to argue on the basis of 'tradition' and 'values' means that in essence these people **are** racially motivated and are potentially on our side.

MALVERN TIPPING
(BNP Regional Organiser, East Anglia)
Framlingham, Suffolk

Sir, — In the last few weeks the mass media in this country have been full of vituperation against Ayatollah Khomeini and the government of Iran. This indicates one thing to me: the Iranians must be doing something right!

F.W. WILLIAMSON (Mrs.)
Dundee

ON THE WAY TO FIGHT WHOSE QUARRELS?
Minesweepers Hurworth and Bicester sail to the Gulf

FRONT COMMITTEE TERMINATES ALLIANCE

THE NATIONALIST ALLIANCE, the formation of which we announced in our July issue, has been terminated by decision of the 'steering committee' of the National Front Support Group — just a short few weeks after that same steering committee had endorsed the alliance, which had originally been proposed on the initiative of its own members.

Initiatives in previous years to bring the splintered nationalist groups in Britain together had all come from the British National Party. After the failure of the last such initiative in 1985, the BNP decided to make no more such moves until some sign was shown of a reciprocal spirit by those in the National Front, the other main nationalist grouping in the country.

Earlier this year, certain representatives of the National Front Support Group (one of the two factions into which the Front split in 1986) approached Mr. Stanley Clayton-Garnett of the BNP, who had been appointed to perform a role of liaison with nationalists outside the party. They proposed the substance of the alliance to Mr. Clayton-Garnett, who then passed the proposition on to party leader John Tyndall. Last May Mr. Tyndall met Mr. Andrew Brons of the NFSG in Leeds and discussed the matter further. Agreement on the basics was reached and Mr. Tyndall pledged the support of the BNP for the alliance, subject to its being endorsed by the committee of the NFSG. The latter was duly done and the alliance announced publicly.

VITRIOLIC ATTACK

Shortly afterwards, to the great surprise of BNP officers, the Chairman of the NFSG committee and Editor of its paper *The Flag* launched a vitriolic attack on the BNP leadership in his editorial column. The BNP refused to allow this provocative act — entirely inconsistent with the spirit of the alliance — to affect its attitude towards the arrangement between the two parties. It was obvious, however, that there was deep division concerning the alliance in the NFSG camp.

Then, shortly after, came the news that the NFSG committee had decided to terminate the very same alliance that its own members had initiated.

It is understood that the pretext for this decision was information, passed on through the 'grapevine', that BNP leader John Tyndall had stated privately to one of his members that he would not agree to a merger between the two parties except on terms which left him as head of the merged organisation and operating under a constitution moulded in all essentials on that of the BNP.

If this is the case, we cannot understand what induced the NFSG to propose and agree to the alliance in the first place. The BNP position on this matter was made clear in a statement in this paper last year. Nothing was ever said to NFSG representatives in recent negotiations to indicate that this position had changed. Discussion of a merger between the two parties did not come within the scope of the agenda in recent talks about the alliance, which concerned itself solely with proposals for practical collaboration between the two groups, while each retained its separate identity. It was implicit that such a merger was eventually desirable and that progress towards it could best be made by means of the operation of the alliance as a half-way stage. In order to facilitate the formation, and subsequent smooth working, of the alliance, BNP representatives have not raised issues which could lead to conflict between the two sides but concentrated on those upon which each could immediately agree. It was in this spirit that the terms of merger were never discussed. At the same time the NFSG should have known what those terms were from the BNP's point of view from the statement previously made upon the subject.

B.N.P. POSITION CLEAR

Mr. Tyndall has made his position clear in the past, and it is perhaps timely to reiterate it here. He is not prepared to hand over control of any unified nationalist party to people who over the past 7 years have proved by their record that they are not capable or qualified for leadership of such a party. Leadership of the National Front since Mr. Tyndall resigned in 1980 has been one continual story of disaster and failure. Likewise the constitution of the NF, which was the main issue in dispute when Mr. Tyndall resigned 7 years ago, has proved its total innefectiveness in the low quality of party leadership that it has produced and in the continual internal division that has racked the Front during that time, as well as before.

There are overwhelmingly strong reasons why, if there is to be a merger between the presently divided nationalist groups, Mr. Tyndall should assume leadership of that merged movement and the BNP constitution, which provides for strong, centralised leadership in the hands of one individual, should in all essentials be adopted for the whole. We believe that were unity to be 'bought' at any other price it would not last five minutes, and meanwhile the gains made in the building up of the BNP would all go to waste under a reign of the same incompetence that has all but destroyed the once powerful National Front.

We did, however, believe, and still believe, that a working alliance between the two organisations would have been far preferable to the past tendency, which was for them to operate in conflict and rivalry with one another. We also believed, and still believe, that the more cordial atmosphere engendered by such an alliance — with closer personal contact between the members of the respective parties — would have made possible the kind of dialogue in which a better understanding of how to overcome differences and work towards eventual full unity could have developed. That was why we agreed to the arrangement proposed by the NFSG earlier this year.

STEP BACKWARD

As the committee of the NFSG has now decided to take a step backward and terminate the alliance, no further useful purpose can be served by negotiating with it towards the aim of nationalist unity. It will be the policy of the BNP, however, to continue to work for unity by means of contact by other people in both factions of the National Front, over the heads of the divisive individuals who prevail on the ruling committees of the two bodies.

Our attitude, in short, is: if unity cannot be achieved with these people, then it will have to be achieved without them.

There are indications that by no means all people in the National Front endorse their leaders' decision to end the alliance. One group of these, the Wirral Branch, has quit the Front in disgust at this decision and has come over to the BNP. A report of this is featured elsewhere on this page. It is naturally to be hoped that others will follow.

A more detailed and comprehensive account of this affair is contained in the September issue of *Spearhead*.

Wirral NF branch comes over to BNP

THE WIRRAL BRANCH of the National Front Support Group decided last month to sever its connections with the NFSG and join the British National Party.

This followed the decision of the NFSG steering committee to terminate the Nationalist Alliance that had been formed between the two organisations earlier this year. This decision was strongly opposed by Wirral NFSG members, one of whom, Mr. Mike Harris, had been instrumental in promoting support for the alliance within the party.

The Wirral Branch was one of the Front's most valued units, and glowing reports of its progress and activities were regularly printed in the party's publications.

The branch will be a very welcome addition to the growing strength of the BNP, particularly since, located as it is on Western Merseyside, it will be in a position to collaborate closely with the party's Liverpool unit. Liverpool BNP, incidentally, has also recently won over a number of new recruits from the other NF faction, based in Suffolk.

In a statement to its members, the Wirral Branch said: "...your support as a nationalist should be given to the ONLY united nationalist party, THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY. It is the majority decision of the committee that the only way to a nationalist Britain is through the strong policies and constitution of the BNP."

The switch of support by Wirral NF to the BNP follows closely on from that of the former NF Doncaster Branch earlier this year and most of the Tower Hamlets Branch in the later part of 1986. Naturally, we hope that many more will take the same course and assist the process of unification.

Contact your local party unit

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY is organised into active units extending over most of the areas of the United Kingdom. Below we give a list of local addresses of the main units:-

NORTH LONDON
PO Box 462, Greenwood Road, Hackney, London E8 4HH

WEST LONDON
PO Box 33, Greenford, Middx. UB6 8DS

SOUTH LONDON
PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS

EAST KENT
73 Shirkoak Park, Woodchurch, Ashford

NORTH ESSEX
PO Box 703, Colchester CO7 9SP

SUFFOLK
2 Albert Road, Framlingham

NORFOLK
A9 Johnson Place, Norwich NR2 2SA

SOUTH WALES
PO Box 214, Cardiff CF3 9YB

BIRMINGHAM
PO Box 771, Great Barr, Birmingham B44 9LZ

STOKE-ON-TRENT
PO Box 320, Tunstall, Stoke

EAST MIDLANDS
PO Box 148, Leicester LE3 2YD

LIVERPOOL
PO Box 116, Liverpool L69 1SH

WIRRAL
PO Box 17, Birkenhead L41 3SF

MANCHESTER & SALFORD
PO Box 16, Salford M6 5EP

LEEDS & BRADFORD
PO Box BR10, Bramley, Leeds 13

DONCASTER
PO Box 73, Doncaster DN4 6BS

TYNE & WEAR
PO Box 8, South Shields NE33 1LP

SCOTLAND
PO Box 85, Glasgow G3 8UL

The BNP also has units in West Kent, Basingstoke (Hants), Gloucestershire, Hertfordshire, Bedford, Luton, Cambridge, Brierley Hill (West Midlands), Burton-on-Trent, Nottingham, Bolton & Bury, Warrington, Halifax, Sheffield, Wakefield, Hull, Sunderland and Lancaster. If you want to make contact with any of these units, or start a new unit, please write to party head office at: PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

BNP Recordings

RALLY '82
Speeches from the BNP national rally in London on October 11th 1982, the theme of which was 'Unite and fight for Britain's future!'
Side 1: Includes speech by Charles Parker; **Side 2:** Speech by John Tyndall.

VOICES OF NATIONALISM
Side 1: Recordings of speeches from the Nationalist Unity rally in London on September 5th 1981. Hear John Tyndall, Kenneth McKilliam, Len Bearsford Walker and others. **Side 2:** Talk by John Tyndall on 'The coming British Revolution'.

TYNDALL SPEAKS I
Side 1: Talk on 'Our Anglo-Saxon heritage' (about the worldwide dispersal of the peoples of British stock); **Side 2:** Talk on 'Britain's economic crisis'.

TYNDALL SPEAKS II
Side 1: Talk on 'The case for nationalism' (the internationalist argument demolished); **Side 2:** Talk on 'Tragedy of the 20th century' (analysis of the results of the 2nd World War).

TYNDALL SPEAKS III
Side 1: Talk on 'Why we must repatriate' (theme self-exlanatory); **Side 2:** Talk on 'Foundations of the national community' (analysis of rights and duties in a racial nationalist state).

These 5 sets of recordings are presented in cassette form and are available at 3.50 each (with 25p postage) from: BNP Recordings, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

SPEARHEAD

For an in-depth view of nationalist policies read *Spearhead*, a 20-page monthly magazine which supports the British National Party. Price 50p. Yearly subscription £8.00. 63p for sample copy to: *Spearhead*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

BUY *BRITISH NATIONALIST* IN BULK

British Nationalist retails at 12p from your local seller. Would bulk purchasers order *only* in the quantities listed below. Standing orders welcomed.

10 copies £1.20 + 37p post
25 copies £2.70 + £1.00 post
50 copies £4.80 + £1.90 post
100 copies £8.40 + £2.35 post
150 copies £12.00 + £2.55 post
200 copies £15.00 + £2.75 post
300 copies £21.00 + £2.95 post
400 copies £26.40 + £3.25 post
500 copies £32.00) Bulk rates
1,000 copies £62.00) by Roadline

Cheques/postal orders to *British Nationalist*, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS. Please keep orders and enquiries concerning *British Nationalist* totally separate from other correspondence in order to avoid delay and confusion.

ACTION IN HARWICH WINS BIG PUBLICITY

THE BRITISH NATIONAL PARTY has recently been extremely active in Harwich (Essex) in a campaign of opposition to the upkeep of Vietnamese 'boat people' there at the taxpayer's expense. After a mass leafletting of the area, the BNP campaign made big headlines in local newspapers and became a regular talking point, resulting in much local interest being engendered in the party.

'ONE WORLD' POISON

(Contd. from page 2)

looking after themselves.

The White World today is sick. And the name of the sickness is LIBERALISM. The one-world idea is just one feature of this liberal sickness, but it is a particularly pernicious one which we must extirpate from our thinking if we are to recover our sanity and health — and indeed to have any kind of future as a species.

WHAT WE STAND FOR

- The return of leadership and statesmanship to British affairs.
- A government that will put British interests first.
- British withdrawal from the European Common Market.
- Closer links with the White Commonwealth.
- Protection of British industry by the selective exclusion of foreign manufactured goods from Britain.
- A sane financial system that will give to the people the purchasing power to buy the goods they produce.
- The revival of British farming.
- British ownership and control of British industry and resources.
- A clamp-down on social security spongers and the restoration of the incentive to work — with the proviso that work is locally available.
- An end to immigration and a start to repatriation.
- British support for the Whites in South Africa.
- An end to financial aid to corrupt Third World regimes.
- The strengthening of Britain's defences.
- Tougher treatment of criminals.
- The smashing of the IRA, the death penalty for terrorists and firm support for the Loyalist majority in Northern Ireland.
- Repealing of the laws permitting Abortion and Homosexuality and a general toughening up of legislation against the promotion of obscenity in the media.
- The elimination of Communism in Britain, in the mass media, in the factory and in the schoolroom.

WRITE TO US

To: British National Party, PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.
(Tick appropriate box)

Please send me more information, for which I enclose 25p ☐

I wish to become a full member and enclose £6 (Half-rate for OAPs and students) ☐

I wish to become an associate member and enclose £3 (no half-rate) ☐

Name.....

Address.....

.....

SUBSCRIBE!

In order to make sure of receiving *British Nationalist* regularly, why not take out a subscription? The rate is £3.45 for 12 issues for subscribers in the British Isles. For subscribers overseas the rate is £4.00 for 12 issues (surface mail). Please make cheques/POs payable to *British Nationalist* and send to PO Box 446, London SE23 2LS.

An additional charge of £5 is required on all foreign currency POs and cheques and an additional £1 on all foreign currency sent in banknotes.

Name.....

Address.....

.....

Printed and published by BN Press, London SE23 2LS